

Physics Department Response to reorganization questionnaire:

1. How do you think an academic re-org, like the ones in the graphic, would impact your department – both positively and negatively – in terms of the following enrollment-related topics? Please explain.

- a. Student recruitment:

The department consensus is that such a reorganization would negatively affect student recruitment of the Physics Department. Students interested in Physics would find it confusing and undesirable to be lumped together with Psychology and Health Professions in particular. First, Health Professions has an Integrative Health Care Major which offers pseudo-scientific classes such as Acupuncture, Aromatherapy, Ayurvedic “Medicine,” Chiropractic “Medicine,” Traditional Chinese “Medicine,” Homeopathy, Herbal “Medicine,” Naturopathy, and Oriental “Medicine.”

Second, Physics students want to be identified as science majors not to be confused with engineers and particularly not to be confused with an engineering technology major. Third, Psychology belongs in Behavioral Science.

- b. Student retention – *If we cannot recruit, we cannot retain.*
- c. Student graduation rates – *If we cannot recruit and retain, we cannot graduate.*

2. How do you think an academic re-org, like the ones in the graphic, would impact your department – both positively and negatively – in terms of the following identity-related topics? Please explain.

- a. Professional recognition:

Professional physicists know that this is just a marketing exercise. Experts in the field base professional stature on the quality of peer-reviewed work. Professional recognition results from these peer-review standards. Reorganization would not positively affect our professional recognition but would have either no effect or, most likely, a negative effect if our work were associated with a college of science and/or engineering that includes non-science or pseudo-science programs.

- b. Department revenue:

The large teaching load, lack of facilities, and lack of matching funds has a much more negative effect on raising outside revenue. However, of concern is the way summer money is earned for the department and shared among the other departments. Will revenue-sharing as done in CLAS be negatively impacted?

c. Program accreditation – NA

3. How do you think an academic re-org, like the ones in the graphic, would impact your department in terms of the following internal university topics? Please explain.

a. Voting representation (such as on Faculty Senate and Council of Chairs & Directors):

This would affect FS representation if the number of senators per number of faculty in each department changes. Will this change? Also, will this change the makeup of other committees, like the academic policies committee for example? Will we change the balance of administrator members and faculty members even if the administrators are non-voting members? This could change the power dynamic on these committees.

b. Collaboration with other departments – *No change.*

4. Are there current projects or projects in the planning stages that you feel would be disrupted by an academic re-org? Please explain.

We are developing an Astronomy concentration and/or minor (perhaps major in the future) and an experimental/applied physics concentration. Lumping us together with departments like Integrative Health Care, hurts development and marketing of any serious STEM program.

5. Are there specific policies or procedures that your department uses that reference or use the current school/college structure? How would they be impacted by an academic re-org?

As an academic discipline, Physics has a reputation for seriousness and for paying fundamental attention to seeking and distributing the truth about how the natural world works. Diluting this fundamental approach with unscientific/pseudo-scientific programs undermines all STEM programs and damages MSUDenver's vision as a serious university.

- a. Does your *department* currently engage in external fundraising?

The large teaching load, lack of facilities, and lack of matching funds has a negative effect on pursuing outside funding.

6. Do you think an academic re-org into smaller colleges (such as the 7 shown in the graphic) would impact fundraising for your department? How about for your college?

No, this is just throwing good money after bad. Rather than reorganizing, why not mount an effective marketing campaign to tell business and industry what we do. The reason for this “reorganization” is that during the president’s “listening” tour she heard from businesses/industries that they do not know what we do. That is outrageously self-serving. They want to control our curriculum so that we train their employees. We should get back to the mission of higher education, seeking and dispensing the truth, not pandering to outside self-serving interests.

7. Using the graphic re-org as a point of discussion, how would your department feel about being in the 5-college version? In the 7-college version? Should MSU Denver continue down the path of collegiate restructuring, where do *you* think your department belongs? [Remember, these are being put forward as models to promote discussion. They are not finalized plans being voted on.]

The ORG chart below illustrates a logical and balanced division of departments, in line with strategic goals and discipline-specific cultures. The departments in each college are easily recognizable by donors and industry and will significantly better serve fundraising campaigns than either of the proposed structures. However, this reorganization is NOT revenue neutral by any means. Any reorganization will cost money. Will any reorganization not require more deans or associate deans?

